SUBJECT No. 14.

A regulation to prevent adulteration of foodstuffs.

Messrs. C. Vaman Rao and N. Subba Rao, Nagar Taluk; T. Venkatappa, Shimoga Taluk; Chikramanna, Byre Gowda and Dodda Vembraliah, Kolar Taluk; and K. Krishnamurti Rao, Magadi Taluk.

Summay of discussion.—As the adulteration of foodstuffs is on the increase from day to day, a regulation to prevent fraud may be passed early. Public health is of paramount importance and the necessary restrictions, even though irksome, should be imposed.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 15.

Amendment of Court Fees Regulation.

Mr. V. Raghavachar, Mysore Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Court fees in cases connected with disputes about lands in *inam* villages, are calculated either on the value of such lands or fifteen times the yield of such lands in the year previous to the suit; while in such cases in Government villages, court fees are calculated at five times the assessment. As there seems to be no reason for such a distinction, the existing law may be amended.

The amendment is necessary at least in suits between two tenants under the same *inamdar*, if not, as between tenant and *inamdar*. In the case of unsettled villages the assessment may be estimated.

Reply of Government.—There are many practical difficulties in carrying out the suggestion. If, however, the member will be good enough to send up detailed proposals in the shape of a draft bill, the matter can be considered.

SUBJECT No. 16.

Amendment of Court Fees Regulation.

Mr. B. Narasinga Rao, Seringapatam Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—1. When a suit is filed for the recovery of a land which forms (i) an entire survey number or a definite share of such survey number, or (ii) a portion of a survey number separately assessed in Government accounts, the value of such lands for the purpose of court fees is ruled to be five times the assessment payable on such land or definite share.

2. Government Notification No. J. 2951, dated 25th March 1908, the wordings of which closely follow those of the Notification No. J. 4328, dated 10th September 1894, says that when a suit is filed to recover a fractional share of a land mentioned above in (ii), the value of the land for the purpose of the computation of court fees shall not exceed five times the revenue rateably payable in respect of the share.

3. The words 'fractional share' in the above notification have been interpreted by the Allahabad High Court (16 All. 493) as applying only to a definite or fractional share and not to a specified portion. This interpretation is followed in some courts in the State. This is clearly a hardship involving at the same time an anomaly of valuing a land when a fractional share (not a specified portion which also forms a fraction of the whole) is claimed at five times the proportionate assessment payable on such portion and when the same fractional share which has

been ascertained by metes and bounds, is claimed that share is to be valued for the purpose of court fees at the market price which often far exceeds five times the assessment of the whole land. For instance, if a survey number or sub-number worth Rs. 500 bears an assessment of Rs. 8 and a $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{8}$ share is claimed, as is generally done in partition suits, that share is required to be valued at five times the proportionate assessment, *viz.*, $2 \times 5 =$ Rs. 10 and $1 \times 5 =$ Rs. 5. If practically the same or a less fractional portion which has been converted into a specified portion by metes and bounds, is claimed, such portion is to be valued at the market price which amounts to Rs. 250 or Rs. 125 respectively. This hardship may be remedied either by directing the valuation at five times the assessment rateably payable on such land, or if the market price of the portion claimed exceeds five times the assessment of the whole land, the court fee may then be levied at five times the assessment of the whole land.

Reply of Government.—The Government Notification is clear enough. But if any doubt exists about its interpretation a test case may be taken to the Chief Court.

SUBJECT No. 17.

Modification of the Infant Marriage Regulation.

Messrs. M. Venkatakrishniah, Madappa and N. Srikantiah, Mysore City Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—According to Hindu medical books a girl is to be married at 16 and a boy at 20. According to the Hindu *Sastras* marriage is optional to a woman as well as to a man. Let it be enacted that the consummation of marriage before a girl is 16 years of age and of a boy before he is 20 years of age is penal. Let it also be enacted that the social persecution of a girl who remains unmarried is penal. If legislation was not expedient, *Panchayet Sabhas* might be constituted to settle such social questions.

Reply of Government.—No legislation is necessary.

SUBJECT No. 18.

(1) The Guardian and Wards Regulation.

(2) Legislation for the efficient management of minors' estates.

(1) Messrs. S. Seetharamaiya and S. R. Balakrishna Rao, Shimoga Municipality.

(2) Mr. K. Sankaranarayana Rao, Nagar Sabha.

Summary of discussion.—(1) As the present minors rules are not comprehensive, the Guardian and Wards Regulation (British Indian Act VIII of 1890) may be introduced.

(2) Under the existing rules, unless persons interested in the welfare of minors come forward and apply for a certificate of guardianship, there is no chance of the interests of minors being safeguarded. Further the expense that an intending guardian has to incur, has a deterrent effect. The result is that minors' estates are allowed to go to waste.

An obligation may be imposed on Taluk Amildars and patels to report all such cases without the least delay, and Amildars may be directed to prepare inventories of all movables and to take charge of them pending orders